UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|----------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/582,567 | 06/12/2006 | Rudiger Schmidt | WUE-54 | 1745 |
| Thomas J Burge | 7590 10/14/200 er | EXAMINER | | |
| Wood Herron & | z Evans | SWIATEK, ROBERT P | | |
| 2700 Carew Tower 441 Vine Street Cincinnati, OH 45202-2917 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 3643 | |
| | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 10/14/2008 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | | |
|--|---|----------------|--|--|--|--|
| Office Action Commence | 10/582,567 | SCHMIDT ET AL. | | | | |
| Office Action Summary | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | |
| | Rob Swiatek | 3643 | | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply | | | | | | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | | | | | | |
| Status | | | | | | |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 Ju | ne 2006 | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is | | | | | |
| | closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Disposition of Claims | | | | | | |
| | Claim(s) <u>1-9</u> is/are pending in the application. | | | | | |
| | 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. | | | | | |
| 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. | | | | | | |
| | 6) Claim(s) <u>1-3 and 9</u> is/are rejected. | | | | | |
| | Claim(s) <u>4-8</u> is/are objected to. | | | | | |
| 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. | | | | | | |
| Application Papers | | | | | | |
| 9)⊠ The specification is objected to by the Examine | r. | | | | | |
| 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). | | | | | | |
| Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). | | | | | | |
| 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. | | | | | | |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 | | | | | | |
| 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) ■ All b) ■ Some * c) ■ None of: 1. ■ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. ■ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. ■ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. | | | | | | |
| Attachment(s) 1) ☑ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) ☑ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6-12-06. | 4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other: | ite | | | | |

DETAILED ACTION

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Koncsek (US 4,991,795). The Koncsek patent discloses an aircraft supersonic inlet including a vent flap 44, a duct 40, an actuator 98, and a force detecting device 102. The air pressure in duct 40 is maintained at a level substantially equal to that of air pressure at the aft portion of forward ramp 32, although the duct pressure could be changed to a desired value by appropriately opening or closing flap 44 (see column 8, lines 43-64, of Koncsek) so that, for example, force on the actuator 98 was essentially zero. Since instant claims 1-3 are drawn to an apparatus, method step limitations contained therein have not been given weight.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sandre (US 3,238,716). The flap 15 of Sandre is positioned such that the static pressure in duct 11 is balanced (see column 3, lines 27-33, of Sandre).

Claim 4 is objected to because of the following informality: In line 5, "charactersied" is a misspelling. Appropriate correction is required.

In the abstract, line 1, the phrase "The invention relates to an" should be changed to – An–.

Application/Control Number: 10/582,567 Page 3

Art Unit: 3643

Claims 4-8 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be

allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and

any intervening claims.

The patents to Ingram et al. (US 3,196,609) and Johnson et al. (US 4,064,692) have been

cited to provide additional examples of gas turbine by-pass arrangements.

/Rob Swiatek/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3643

Ph.: 571/272-6894 9 October 2008